



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

from a number of minor verbal differences, there is at least one passage in the later (1744) English edition [also in the ed. of 1746] which is wanting both in the earlier version and in the German translation. The passage includes ll. 1184-6 (ed. 1744):

"and where its mazes stray'd,  
While with each other blest, creative love  
Still bade eternal Eden smile around."

Perhaps it will be helpful to compare at least one passage from the *Celadon and Amelia* episode of 1744 with the corresponding passage as found in the text of 1730.

*Summer*, ll. 1206-8, ed. 1744 :

"From his void embrace,  
Mysterious heaven ! that moment, *to the ground*  
*A blacken'd corse, was struck* the beauteous maid."

*Summer*, ll. 937-9, ed. 1730 :

"From his void embrace,  
Mysterious heaven ! that moment, *in a heap*  
*Of pallid ashes fell* the beauteous maid."

The translator's version here, as indeed throughout the three episodes, faithfully follows the *text*, though not necessarily the *edition*, of 1730 for, as I have already pointed out, the edition of 1738 is virtually parallel with it. The German version of the passage just quoted reads as follows :

"Aus seinen Armen *fiel*, o des geheimen Schicksals !  
Das schöne Kind denselben Augenblick  
*In einen Aschshaufen*."

Proceeding on the assumption that for the purpose in hand the text, but to repeat, not necessarily the edition, of 1730 is to be regarded as authoritative, I renumber the three passages as follows :

1. The *Lavinia* passage = *Autumn*, ll. 184-307.
2. The *Damon* passage = *Summer*, ll. 980-1037.
3. The *Celadon und Amalia* passage = *Summer*, ll. 897-944.

A glance will show that this numbering differs in each case from that of Vetter.

C. H. IBERSHOFF.

*Harvard University.*

## THE SUITORS IN THE *PARLEMENT* OF *FOULES* AGAIN

It is a pleasure to express my appreciation of the article by Mr. Samuel Moore of Harvard in the January number of the *Notes*, because his facts do, in some sense, reenforce the case I presented in the July number of *Modern Philology*. I am pleased also, that he so fully accepts the conclusions of that paper. Yet I should like to correct one point in which Mr. Moore seems to do my paper something of injustice. It occurs in the following passage :

"Professor Emerson decides without hesitation that the second eagle represents Friedrich of Meissen. His chief reason for the decision is that it would be 'a strange procedure on Chaucer's part to introduce, as a rival suitor of Richard, one whose betrothal had been broken off as early as 1373, at least seven, perhaps nine years before the time of the poem.' He offers no evidence of the breaking off of the earlier match."

A reading of the original article<sup>1</sup> will show that in these sentences I am calling attention to Professor Koch's reference to "the strange procedure on Chaucer's part," and his emphasis upon the possible lack of knowledge regarding affairs in Germany.<sup>2</sup> My real argument begins with the next sentence, which Mr. Moore does not quote : "At any rate Chaucer would scarcely have been likely to use this long-past betrothal, if there had been a more active suitor in the field." I then present at length the extremely active three, Friedrich of Meissen, Charles of France, and Richard II. My argument, then, is in the activity of these three, and their closer relation in time than any other suitor who has yet been named. If accepted at all, the reasoning carries with it the exclusion of any fourth suitor, especially one in whose case no activity has yet been proved for almost ten years before Anne's marriage.

To put the matter in another way, in his poem Chaucer had limited the suitors of Anne to three. The three chronologically nearest her marriage were those I have just named. They, also, are logically the only ones to be considered, because of

<sup>1</sup> *Modern Philology*, VIII, 47.

<sup>2</sup> *Essays on Chaucer*, 407-8.

their active relations in the matter extending up to the marriage of Anne, and in the case of Friedrich of Meissen far beyond. By the limits of the problem, therefore, as well as on chronological and logical grounds, the serious consideration of any other than these three suitors seemed to me then, as it seems to me now, quite unnecessary. To argue further for the exclusion of William of Baiern-Holland seemed a work of supererogation.

On the other hand if, in the future, any one should attempt to displace Friedrich of Meissen or one of the other suitors, and again introduce William of Baiern-Holland, he must reckon with the data Mr. Moore has brought forward. Or if any one should wish to show why Chaucer chose three rather than four suitors, he might find the reason in Mr. Moore's added facts. Until one of these courses is adopted I cannot see that these facts are so necessary to my argument as Mr. Moore seems to think.

Another evidence of friendly relations between the reigning houses of England and Hainault might have been cited by Mr. Moore. It is earlier than the account of the visit of Anne to the duke and duchess of Brabant on her journey to England, and I have used it, together with Mr. Moore's second quotation from Froissart (p. 10), in the paper to which I referred in a footnote to my *Modern Philology* article, that on the date of the *Knight's Tale*. That article has been in type since last summer, but is not yet published.<sup>5</sup> The additional reference is in Froissart's *Chronicles*, II, ch. xliii (Johnes, I, 593). It tells how, when Sir Simon Burley started from Germany to negotiate for the hand of Anne,—he was appointed June 12, 1380 (Rymer's *Fœdera*, VII, 257),—he visited the duke and duchess of Brabant at Brussels, and there met duke Albert of Hainault and other lords who had gathered for a "great feast of tilts and tournaments." Sir Simon made known his errand, and

"The duke and duchess of Brabant . . . were much rejoiced on hearing the cause of his journey into Germany, and said it would be a good match between the king of England and their niece. They gave Sir Simon Burley, on his departure, special letters to the emperor, to assure him they approved very much of this marriage."

<sup>5</sup>In January, when this was written. It has since appeared.

If Duke Albert of Hainault had wished to oppose the betrothal of Richard and Anne on account of his son, here was ample opportunity just as the negotiations were beginning. The absence of the slightest evidence connecting that son with Anne after 1373 shows how unnecessary it is even to consider William of Baiern-Holland, as compared with the indispensable Friedrich of Meissen.

Still, in either case, the conclusions are the same, and the further data regarding one of Anne's earlier suitors are interesting in themselves, whether essential or not. Let me add that before Mr. Moore's article appeared I had come to consider less valuable the suggestion of Professor Koch,<sup>4</sup> quoted in my former article, that "people most likely had not a very clear notion as to affairs in Germany." Something like international exchange of news, to an extent we are likely to underestimate, must have been common even in the fourteenth century.

It is interesting to note, also, Mr. Moore's further interpretation of the last lines in the *Parlement of Foules*. Yet is he quite right in assuming that his interpretation is wholly new? In discussing the *Legend of Good Women*, Mr. R. K. Root<sup>6</sup> gives essentially the same suggestion, referring the desired favor to the relief from official duties in February, 1385. Even before that, Koch had interpreted the last lines as indicating "that Chaucer was searching for a new subject to work upon," though he does not note Chaucer's purpose in the expression "for to fare The bet."

I cannot let this note go to print without expressing my regret that the study of the suitors of Anne did not develop something more definite regarding the date of the *Parlement*. The astronomical reference in line 117, as interpreted by Professor Koch,<sup>6</sup> must refer that portion to the year 1380 or 1382. It seems impossible that the poem could have been written in the latter year without some more definite reference to the marriage, or at least the accomplished betrothal of Richard and Anne. Yet the year 1380 is too early for at least the latter part of the poem, since the year's delay, symbolized in the request of

<sup>4</sup>*Essays on Chaucer*, 407-8.

<sup>5</sup>*The Poetry of Chaucer*, p. 140; cf. also p. 64.

<sup>6</sup>*Chronology of Chaucer's Works* (Chaucer Soc.), p. 37 f.

Anne for "respit" "until this yeer be doon" could not have been foreseen.

One middle ground between these two assumptions has perhaps occurred to others, although I believe not before suggested. Perhaps Chaucer wrote the introduction, or proem, at the earlier date, with or without reference to the marriage of Richard and Anne, though the marriage with a Bohemian princess had been proposed as early as June, 1380. Indeed the translation of the *Dream of Scipio* may once have been independent of any relation to the later subject of the king's courtship. It has little connection with the later story of the "formel egle" and her suitors,<sup>7</sup> except to introduce the guide "African" who, although he grasps the poet's hand in lines 169-70, is never again mentioned. Does the poet forget his benefactor, or are we to assume that he here intends a subtle characteristic of the psychology of dreams?

Yet whether the *Dream of Scipio* was written as an introduction to the later story or not, if the single stanza invoking Citherea is accounted for as belonging to the summer of 1380, the rest of the poem may be assigned with some confidence to 1381.<sup>8</sup> In the latter case it would have preceded, instead of followed, the *Palamon and Arcite*, or the *Knight's Tale* as we know it.<sup>9</sup> This

<sup>7</sup> We might except, perhaps, the first two stanzas, which, however, are general, rather than specific, on the subject of love, and not unlike many other lines of the poet. So the invocation to Venus (ll. 113-19) is only loosely connected with the general story, and even breaks the natural continuity of lines 112 and 120. Yet I cannot go so far as Mr. Root in calling the *Dream of Scipio* "an unfortunate bit of introductory machinery" (*The Poetry of Chaucer*, p. 66).

<sup>8</sup> It must be remembered also that, according to the terms of the betrothal made in May, 1381, Anne was expected in England "about the feast of St. Michael," or September 29. The poet might therefore have been completing his poem not later than the summer of 1381. Besides, as the formal betrothal is mentioned in the poem no more than the marriage, the year's delay may have applied to the time between the opening of negotiations in June, 1380, and the actual betrothal in May, 1381. The poem may have been completed any time after the latter event.

<sup>9</sup> Professor Lowes suggests this order in "The Prologue to the Legend of Good Women," etc., *Publications of the Mod. Lang. Ass'n.*, xx, 861, footnote. With more confidence, he also places the *Parlement* before the *Palamon* in his article on "The Date of Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde," *Ibid.*, xxiii, 290. Professor Tatlock also pre-

would fully account for the omission of reference to the marriage, and show why the poem considered the courtship only. Perhaps it was first publicly presented in welcoming the new queen.<sup>10</sup>

It may be, too, that the problem of the date of the *Parlement* will be finally worked out in the relations of its ampler description of the garden of love,<sup>11</sup> and the more concise description of the temple of Venus in the *Knight's Tale*,<sup>12</sup> both based in the main on Boccaccio's *Teseide*. While no proof has yet been brought forward that the longer description was written first, it seems to me that is more natural than the reverse order.<sup>13</sup> If that be so, and the *Parlement* preceded the *Palamon*, the latter would be the subject which Chaucer alludes to, by anticipation, at the close of the former poem. Led to use the *Teseide*, as he had in the *Parlement*, and continuing to read it more thoroughly, the poet saw how he could mold a larger portion of it into the *Palamon and Arcite*, and this became his next venture. In any case, I cannot but think that 1381 is a much better date for the former poem than 1382.

OLIVER FARRAR EMERSON.

*Western Reserve University.*

fers 1380 to 1382 for the *Parlement* in *Development and Chronology of Chaucer's Works*, p. 43.

<sup>10</sup> As a side light on the question of date, it is difficult to explain the description of the "parliament" itself (ll. 519-619), without feeling that it is a satire upon this form of government. If so, it could scarcely have had a fitter subject than the parliament of Northampton, which met in November, 1380. The fiasco which this parliament made in its poll-tax proposals, and the consequent troubles of the year 1381, may easily have led many Englishmen to feel that representative government lacked many of the elements of success. Even the "Good" parliament of 1376 could scarcely have borne that name among courtiers, while most of those which followed for several years were anti-Lancastrian, and this would have probably meant that they had little of Chaucer's sympathy. Perhaps on this account he now directed his satire against the Commons. Later he was bold enough to speak out with even greater severity on political subjects in lines 939-952 (E. 995-1008) of the *Griselda* story, and in *Lack of Steadfastness*.

<sup>11</sup> Ll. 183 to 294.

<sup>12</sup> Ll. 1060 to 1108; A. 1918 to 1966.

<sup>13</sup> I note that Professor Lowes, in his article on "The Prologue to the Legend of Good Women" and the note cited above, thinks that on the score of precedence "honors are easy."